

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,202	01/16/2001	James E. Mathews	03797.00090	6561
28319	7590 11/06/200			
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD., ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT 1001 G STREET , N.W.			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, JENNIFER T	
ELEVENTH WASHINGT	STREET ON, DC 20001-4597		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2674	
			DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	•	09/759,202	MATHEWS ET AL.		
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Jennifer T Nguyen	2674		
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address		
THE M - Extens after S - If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is is increased above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply seriod for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a re within the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB.	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 J	lanuary 2001 .			
2a)□		is action is non-final.			
3)□ Dispositio	Since this application is in condition for allowatelosed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims	ance except for formal mat Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	ters, prosecution as to the merits is 0. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
4)⊠ (Claim(s) $1-38$ is/are pending in the application				
4	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.			
5) 🗌 (Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ (Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are rejected.				
7) 🗌 (Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) 🗌 (Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.			
Applicatio		•			
9) <u></u> ⊤	he specification is objected to by the Examiner	. .			
10)□ Ti	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	ted or b) objected to by th	e Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) <u> </u>	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.			
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13) 🗌 🛮 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) <u></u>] All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
1	. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.			
2	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Ap	oplication No		
	B. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bure the attached detailed Office action for a list of the actio	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_		
	knowledgment is made of a claim for domestic				
_a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language procknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	visional application has be	en received.		
Attachment(s					
2) Notice 3) Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152) .		
J.S. Patent and Trac PTO-326 (Rev.		tion Summary	Part of Paper No. 4		

Art Unit: 2674

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-14, 16-33 and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hardin, Sr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,817,034).

Regarding claims 1 and 20, referring to Figs. 1 and 8A, Hardin teaches a method for detecting an in air gesture comprising step of: determining whether a digitizing pen (22) is not in contact with a digitizing writing surface (20); determining whether the digitizing pen (22) is in motion with respect to the digitizing writing surface (20); recording positional information of the digitizing pen (22) with respect to the surface of the digitizing writing surface (20) within a moving buffer (14) when the digitizing pen (22) is determined to not be in contact with the digitizing writing surface (20) and when the digitizing pen (22) is determined to be in motion with respect to the digitizing writing surface (20), the moving buffer (14) recording a predetermined amount of positional information spanning a predetermined amount of time while

Art Unit: 2674

the digitizing pen (22) is in motion and not in contact with the digitizing writing surface (20); determining when the digitizing pen (22) has stopped motion with respect to the surface of the digitizing writing surface (20) while the digitizing pen (22) is not in contact with the digitizing writing surface (20); and determining whether positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture that can be made with the digitizing pen (22) (from col. 10, line 50 to col. 11, line 23).

Regarding claims 2 and 21, Hardin teaches displaying (12) a predetermined user interface panel when the positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture that can be made with the digitizing pen (22) (Fig. 1 and from col. 10, line 50 to col. 11, line 23).

Regarding claims 3-7 and 22-26, Hardin teaches the in-air gesture is a down spike motion, up spike motion, right spike motion, left spike motion (col. 15, lines 32-67 and col. 16, lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 11-13 and 30-32, Hardin teaches positional information recorded in the moving buffer corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture is based on a detected motion shape, motion size, motion speed (col. 15, lines 32-67 and col. 16, lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 8 and 27, Hardin teaches the predetermined amount of positional information is about 200 points of coordinate information (col. 10, lines 50-55).

Regarding claims 9 and 28, Hardin teaches the predetermined amount of time that positional information is recorded in the moving buffer is about 1 second (col. 10, lines 50-55).

Regarding claims 10 and 29, Hardin teaches the moving buffer (14) includes positional information corresponding to a starting point and an ending point, and wherein the step of

Art Unit: 2674

determining whether positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to the predetermined in-air gesture is based on a relative position of the starting point with respect to the ending point (from col. 10, line 50 to col. 11, line 23).

Regarding claims 14 and 33, Hardin teaches the digitizing pen (22) and digitizing writing surface (20) are electromagnetic devices (col. 3, lines 45-50).

Regarding claims 16 and 35, Hardin teaches the digitizing pen (22) is not in contact with the digitizing writing surface (20) includes a step of receiving an input indicating that the digitizing pen (22) is in a hovering state (col. 11, lines 14-23, col. 15, lines 23-67).

Regarding claims 17, 18, 36 and 37, Hardin teaches sending a predetermined sequence of characters to an application program when the positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture that can be made with the digitizing pen (22) (col. 2, lines 1-8).

Regarding claims 19 and 38, Hardin teaches sending a predetermined command to an application program when the positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture that can be made with the digitizing pen (22) (from col. 10, line 50 to col. 11, line 23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2674

5. Claims 15 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardin, Sr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,817,034) in view of Black (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,956).

Regarding claims 15 and 34, Hardin differs from claims 15 and 34 in that he not specifically teach the digitizing pen and digitizing writing surface are optical devices. However, referring to Figs. 1B and 2A, Black discloses digitizing pen and digitizing writing surface are optical devices (col. 19, lines 3-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the digitizing pen and digitizing writing surface are optical devices as taught by Black in the system of Hardin in order to provide a fine line pattern or image on the resist surface.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Beaton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,340,979) teaches contextual gesture interface.

Ebisawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,802) teaches handwritten data input device having coordinate detection tablet.

Crooks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,587,560) teaches portable handwritten data capture device and method of using.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jennifer T. Nguyen** whose telephone number is **703-305-3225**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard A Hjerpe** can be reach at **703-305-4709**.

Art Unit: 2674

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to: 703-872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA, sixth-floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Jennifer T. Nguyen Patent Examiner Art Unit 2674

> RICHARD HJERPE IPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CERTER 2000